Draft version October 31, 2014
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 5/2/11

arXiv:1410.8514v1 [astro-ph.GA] 30 Oct 2014

ORIGIN OF THE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SUPERMASSIVE BLACK HOLES AND THEIR HOST GALAXIES

Sydney Sherman[1,2], Mouyuan Sun[1,2,3], Qirong Zhu[1,2], Jonathan R. Trump[1,2,†], Yuexing Li[1,2]
[1]Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, The Pennsylvania State University, 525 Davey Lab, University Park, PA 16802, USA
[2]Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA
[3]Department of Astronomy and Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Xiamen University, Xiamen, Fujian 361005, China
and
[†]Hubble Fellow

Draft version October 31, 2014

ABSTRACT

Observations have shown that supermassive black holes in nearby elliptical galaxies correlate tightly with the stellar velocity dispersion (the $M_{\rm BH}-\sigma$ relation) and the stellar mass (the $M_{\rm BH}-M_{\rm host}$ relation) of their host spheroids. However, the origin of these correlations remains ambiguous. In a previous paper by Zhu et al., we proposed a model which links the M-σ relation to the the dynamical state of the system and the $M_{\rm BH}-M_{\rm host}$ relation to the self-regulation of galaxy growth. To test this model, we compile a sample of observed galaxies with different properties and examine the dependence of the above correlations on these parameters. We find that galaxies that satisfy the the $M_{\rm BH}-\sigma$ correlation appear to have reached virial equilibrium, as indicated by the ratio between kinetic energy and gravitational potential, 2K/U ~ 1. Furthermore, the ratio of black hole accretion rate to star formation rate remains nearly constant, BHAR /SFR $\sim 10^{-3}$, in active galaxies over a wide range of mass in the redshift range z=0 - 3. These results confirm our theoretical model that the observed correlations have different origins: the $M_{\rm BH}-\sigma$ relation may result from galaxy relaxation, while the $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ relation may be due to self-regulated black hole accretion and star formation in galaxies.

Subject headings: active galactic nuclei, black holes, black hole – galaxy scaling relations, galaxy evolution

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, it has been determined that a supermassive black hole resides in the center of nearly every galaxy. Furthermore, tight correlations have been found between black hole mass and host galaxy properties (see Kormendy & Ho 2013 for a recent review), such as stellar velocity dispersion (the $M_{\rm BH}-\sigma$ correlation, e.g., Ferrarese & Merritt 2000; Gebhardt et al. 2000; Tremaine et al. 2002; Gültekin et al. 2009b; Graham et al. 2011) and bulge stellar mass (the $M_{\rm BH}-M_{\rm bulge}$ correlation, e.g., Magorrian et al. 1998; Marconi & Hunt 2003; Häring & Rix 2004). Beyond the local universe it is difficult to reliably distinguish the bulge from the rest of the galaxy, and the $M_{\rm BH}-M_{\rm bulge}$ relation is generalized as the $M_{\rm BH}-M_{\rm host}$ relation between the black hole mass and total stellar mass of the host galaxy.

Recent studies have placed tighter constraints on the slopes of the relationships by obtaining more accurate black hole and galaxy measurements to understand the evolution of the M - σ and $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ relations (e.g., Peng et al. 2006; Treu et al. 2007; Gültekin et al. 2009b; Jahnke et al. 2009; Merloni et al. 2010; Bennert et al. 2011; Schramm & Silverman 2013; McConnell & Ma 2013; Sun et al. 2014). Observational studies beyond the local universe are complicated by a significant Eddington bias caused by the steeply declining black hole and galaxy mass functions coupled with large errors in estimating $M_{\rm BH}$ and intrinsic scatter in $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ (Lauer et al. 2007; Shen & Kelly 2010). In addition, for galaxies beyond ∼200 Mpc $M_{\rm BH}$ can only be estimated in luminous broad-line AGNs, which frequently outshine their host galaxies and make it difficult to measure half light radius and stellar velocity dispersion for the host galaxy. Most observations which account for these challenges find little evidence for evolution in $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ relation from $z\sim 2$ to $z\sim 0$ (e.g. Jahnke et al. 2009; Schramm & Silverman 2013; Sun et al. 2014).

Multi-wavelength surveys in deep *Hubble Space Telescope* (*HST*) fields allow for detailed studies of AGN and host galaxy properties. More specifically, the black hole accretion rate (BHAR) can be reliably determined using X-rays, and far-infrared (FIR) data allow for the calculation of a host galaxy's star formation rate (SFR) with no contamination from the AGN (e.g., Mullaney et al. 2012a; Rosario et al. 2013a,b; Sun et al. 2014). Both of these properties are useful in understanding the evolution of a galaxy and its supermassive black hole. With further constraints on the BHAR and SFR, it can be determined if evolution — or lack therof — is actually coevolution. Recent observations suggest that there is a correlation between BHAR and SFR in an *average* sense (Mullaney et al. 2012a; Chen et al. 2013; Sun et al. 2014), but with less evidence for a connection in *individual* galaxies (Mullaney et al. 2012c), possibly due to AGN variability (Hickox et al. 2014). In particular, Sun et al. (2014) combined robust measurements of both $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ and BHAR - SFR, along with careful modeling of the selection biases, to demonstrate that black hole accretion and star formation correlate in such a way to "self-maintain" the observed constant $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ relation.

Despite advancements in measurement techniques, the physical origins of these correlations remains unclear (for

sxs5520@psu.edu

a review, see Section 8 of Kormendy & Ho 2013). Recently, Zhu et al. (2012) studied the BH – galaxy relations with high-resolution cosmological simulations and found that the $M_{\rm BH}-\sigma$ relation evolves significantly with redshift, but the $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ relation shows little evolution. The authors suggested that the $M_{\rm BH}-\sigma$ and $M_{\rm BH}-M_{\rm host}$ relations have different origins, the former being a result of virial equilibrium of the system, while the latter owing to self-regulated growth of galaxies.

In this work, we focus on determining the origins of both the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ and the $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ relations and testing the model of Zhu et al. (2012) by compiling a sample of galaxies with different properties (e.g., mass, type, kinematics, etc.) and at different redshift, and examine the dependence of the above correlations on these parameters. In Section 2, we outline the samples used in our study. The results are presented in Section 3, and we summarize in Section 4.

2. SAMPLES

In order to effectively study the origins of the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ and the $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ relations, two separate samples of galaxies were required. The first sample, used to study the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ correlation consists of elliptical, lenticular, and spiral galaxies (tables 1 and 2). The second sample contains spiral galaxies and AGN, and is used to study the $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ correlation (Table 3, Lusso et al. 2011 and Sun et al. 2014 samples).

Sample 1 is drawn from five recent studies (Marconi & Hunt 2003; Gültekin et al. 2009b; Kormendy et al. 2011; Greene et al. 2010; Sani et al. 2011) of the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ and $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ correlations, and contains 72 galaxies. These papers were chosen because they presented galaxy type, distance, black hole mass, k-band absolute magnitudes, and stellar velocity dispersions for each of the galaxies. The final parameter of interest to this study, the half-light effective radius, was not presented in all five of the papers, and was therefore obtained from other sources. The galaxy parameters and their references are detailed in Tables 1 and 2.

In order to study the $M_{\rm BH}$ - $M_{\rm host}$ correlation, it was necessary to have X-ray and FIR luminosities, which are tracers of BHAR and SFR (Kennicutt 1998) respectively. While we were able to obtain X-ray luminosities for the majority of galaxies in our elliptical sample, it is likely that the X-ray luminosity was produced by hot gas rather than BH accretion. Similarly, FIR (as well as UV, Hα and other SFR tracers Kennicutt 1998) luminosities for these ellipticals were not likely to be due to star formation, but other processes. In order to overcome this BHAR and SFR tracer problem, we created a separate sample that contains active galaxies with robust SFR and BHAR estimates.

Sample 2 contains 70 broad-lined AGN from Sun et al. (2014), 11 narrow-lined AGN from Hainline et al. (2012), 17 narrow-lined AGN from Lusso et al. (2011), and 5 spiral galaxies from Sample 1 that had published SFR and X-ray luminosities. In this sample, the only galaxies with BH masses are those from Sun et al. (2014) sample and the five spiral galaxies. All other galaxies in Sample 2 are narrow-lined, and do not have BH mass estimates. Regardless of the original sample from which the galaxies were taken, all of the galaxies in Sample 2 have SFR values, X-ray (or bolometric) luminosity, and galaxy stellar mass. The Hainline et al. (2012) values come directly from Table 4 of that paper, while our Lusso et al. (2011) sample was taken from a larger sample of 225 galaxies from the Lusso et al. (2011) paper. We obtained the 17 galaxies from Lusso et al. (2011) by first removing any galaxies that were missing measurements for bolometric luminosity, SFR, stellar mass, or redshift. We then removed galaxies in all but three morphological classes (disk-dominated, irregular, and compact/irregular) that were defined by Lusso et al. (2011). Finally, the five spiral galaxies were obtained from our larger collection of spirals in Sample 1 because they had both SFR and X-ray luminosity measurements.

3. RESULTS

3.1. *The M-σ Correlation*

Figure 1 shows the well-studied M-σ correlation from our compiled sample. The red and blue fits correspond to the spirals and ellipticals respectively, while the black dashed-line is from McConnell & Ma (2013). It can clearly be seen that the elliptical galaxies more closely follow the fit from McConnell & Ma (2013) than the spiral sample. The fitting line for the spirals noticeably diverges from the McConnell & Ma (2013) fit and has a much shallower slope. The differing fit lines for spirals and ellipticals suggests that the elliptical galaxies more closely follow the M-σ correlation than spiral galaxies.

While there is some deviation from the trend lines in both the elliptical and spiral samples, this can be explained by the inconsistencies in the methods used to determine BH mass and σ values across the multiple samples from which these values were obtained. The most common of which are dynamical measurements (Marconi & Hunt 2003; Kormendy et al. 2011; Sani et al. 2011; Gültekin et al. 2009b) and megamaser disk measurements (e.g., Greene et al. 2010).



Figure 1. The $M_{\rm BH}$-σ correlation for the spiral and elliptical samples. The red and blue fits correspond to the spirals and ellipticals respectively. It can be seen that the ellipticals more closely follow the fit of McConnell & Ma (2013) than the spiral galaxies.

In Zhu et al. (2012), it was suggested that M-σ correlation is a result of virial equilibrium when 2K + U= 0, where

$$K = \frac{3}{2} M_* \sigma^2$$

Table 1
Elliptical/Lenticular Sample

Galaxy Name[1]	Type[2]	D[3] (Mpc)	M_{BH}[4] ($M_\odot$)	σ[5] (km s^{-1})	M_K[6]	r_e[7] (kpc)	Ref[8]
A1836-BCG	E	157.5	3.9 x 10^9	288	-25.95	0.099	2,10,5
A3565-BCG	E	54.4	5.2 x 10^8	322	-25.98	0.0916	2,10,5
CenA	S0/E	4.4	3.0 x 10^8	150	-22.94	2.21	3
Cygnus A	E	240	2.9 x 10^9	270	-27.3	31.0	1
IC 1459	E4	30.9	2.8 x 10^9	340	-25.69	9.15	3
IC 4296	E	50.8	1.35 x 10^9	226	-27.62	8.28	3
M84/NGC 4374	E1	18.4	1.0 x 10^9	296	-25.7	8.2	1
M87	E1	17.0	3.6 x 10^9	375	-25.37	8.2	3
NGC 1399	E1	21.1	5.1 x 10^8	337	-25.29	3.63	2,10,6
NGC 221	E2	0.86	3.1 x 10^6	75	-18.79	0.12	3
NGC 2549	S0	12.3	1.4 x 10^7	145	-22.17	0.69	3
NGC 2778	E2	22.9	1.4 x 10^7	175	-23.0	3.0	1
NGC 2974	E4	21.5	1.7 x 10^8	227	-24.09	2.83	3
NGC 3115	S0	9.7	9.1 x 10^8	230	-24.4	4.7	1
NGC 3245	S0	20.9	2.1 x 10^8	205	-23.75	1.3	4,4,1
NGC 3377	E5	11.2	1.0 x 10^8	145	-23.6	5.4	1
NGC 3379	E0	11.7	1.2 x 10^8	206	-24.2	1.7	2,1,6
NGC 3384	S0	11.6	1.6 x 10^7	143	-22.6	0.49	1
NGC 3414	S0	25.2	2.51 x 10^8	205	-23.49	2.67	3
NGC 3585	S0	21.2	3.4 x 10^8	213	-24.67	1.59	3
NGC 3607	E1	19.9	1.2 x 10^8	229	-24.44	4.3	3
NGC 3608	E1	23.0	2.1 x 10^8	182	-23.74	6.29	3
NGC 3998	S0	14.9	2.4 x 10^8	305	-23.29	0.34	3
NGC 4026	S0	15.6	2.1 x 10^8	180	-23.14	0.86	3
NGC 4261	E2	33.4	5.5 x 10^8	315	-25.27	3.66	3
NGC 4291	E2	26.2	3.1 x 10^8	242	-23.9	2.3	1
NGC 4342	S0	18.0	3.6 x 10^8	225	-22.26	0.29	4,4,1
NGC 4459	E2	17.0	7.4 x 10^7	167	-24.5	3.24	2,1,7
NGC 4473	E4	17.0	1.3 x 10^8	190	-23.8	3.98	2,1,8
NGC 4486A	E2	17.0	1.3 x 10^7	111	-21.8	0.65	2,3,9
NGC 4552	E	15.3	5.0 x 10^8	252	-24.32	1.8	3
NGC 4564	S0	17.0	6.9 X 10^7	162	-23.4	1.59	2,1,8
NGC 4621	E5	18.3	4.0 x 10^8	225	-23.64	5.46	3
NGC 4649	E2	16.5	2.1 x 10^9	385	-25.37	3.77	3
NGC 4697	E6	12.4	2.0 x 10^8	177	-23.02	6.04	3
NGC 4742	E4	15.5	1.4 x 10^7	90	-23.0	2.0	1
NGC 5077	E3	44.9	8.0 x 10^8	222	-25.09	6.35	3
NGC 524	S0	33.6	8.32 x 10^8	235	-25.37	4.37	3
NGC 5252	S0	96.8	1.0 x 10^9	190	-25.6	9.7	1
NGC 5576	E3	27.1	1.8 x 10^8	183	-22.97	4.51	3
NGC 5813	E1	32.2	7.1 x 10^8	230	-24.37	17.4	3
NGC 5845	E3	28.7	2.9 x 10^8	234	-23.27	0.51	3
NGC 5846	E0	24.9	1.1 x 10^9	237	-25.04	4.4	3
NGC 6251	E1	106	6.0 x 10^8	290	-26.24	21.8	3
NGC 7052	E3	70.9	4.0 x 10^8	266	-25.19	13.5	3
NGC 7457	S0	14.0	4.1 x 10^6	67	-21.8	4.31	2,1,8
NGC 821	E4	25.5	4.2 x 10^7	209	-23.720	7.86	3

[1] Galaxy Name.
[2] Morphological type.
[3] Distance in Megaparsecs.
[4] BH mass in units of solar mass.
[5] Stellar velocity dispersion.
[6] K Band bulge magnitude.
[7] Effective radius in kiloparsecs.
[8] References are written as: "reference for columns 1-5," "reference for column 6," "reference for column 7". If there is only one number, it indicates the reference for columns 1-7. References: 1. Marconi & Hunt (2003), 2. Gültekin et al. (2009b), 3. Sani et al. (2011), 4. Kormendy et al. (2011), 5.Dalla Bontà et al. (2009), 6. Faber et al. (1997), 7. Kormendy et al. (2010), 8.Novak et al. (2006), 9. Prugniel et al. (2011), 10. Kormendy & Ho (2013).

Table 2
Spiral Sample

Galaxy Name[1]	Type[2]	D[3] (Mpc)	M_{BH}[4] ($M_\odot$)	σ[5] (km s^{-1})	M_K[6] (kpc)	r_e[7]	Ref[8]	L_x[9] (ergs s^{-1})	SFR[10] ($M_\odot$ yr^{-1})
Circinus	Sb	4.0	1.7 x 10^6	158	-21.79	0.21	3	41.48	1.28
IC 2560	SBb	40.7	4.4 x 10^6	144	-22.87	5.43	3	-	-
M31/NGC 0224	Sb	0.8	4.5 x 10^7	160	-22.8	1.0	1	-	-
Milky Way	SBbc	0.008	4.1 x 10^6	103	-22.3	0.7	1	-	-
NGC 1023	SB0	12.1	4.0 x 10^7	205	-23.07	1.41	3	-	-
NGC 1068	Sb	15.4	8.6 x 10^6	151	-23.79	0.73	3	39.54	0.54
NGC 1300	SB(rs)bc	20.1	7.1 x 10^7	218	-21.71	0.422	2,15,7	39.93	0.2
NGC 1316	SB0	19.0	1.62 x 10^8	226	-24.72	8.57	3	-	-
NGC 2273	SB(r)a:	26.0	7.58 x 10^6	144.54	-22.07	1.97	4,15,9	-	-
NGC 2748	Sc	24.9	4.7 x 10^7	115	-20.56	0.82	2,15,14	-	-
NGC 2787	SB0	7.9	4.3 x 10^7	189	-21.37	0.6	3	-	-
NGC 2960	Sa?	71.0	1.12 x 10^7	165.96	-24.36	0.62	4,15,10	-	-
NGC 3031	Sb	4.1	8.0 x 10^7	143	-22.82	2.53	3	-	-
NGC 3079	SBcd	15.9	2.5 x 10^6	146	-22.37	5.71	3	-	-
NGC 3227	SBa	17.0	2.0 x 10^7	133	-21.52	6.83	3	41.55	0.48
NGC 3384	SB0	11.7	1.0 x 10^7	143	-22.82	0.25	3	-	-
NGC 3393	(R')SB(rs)	53.6	3.09 x 10^7	147.91	-23.03	2.26	4,15,11	-	-
NGC 4151	Sa	20.0	6.5 x 10^7	156	-22.39	0.52	3	-	-
NGC 4258	SABbc	7.2	3.78 x 10^7	115	-21.54	3.9	3	-	-
NGC 4388	SA(s)b:	19.0	8.51 x 10^6	107.15	-20.55	3.33	4,15,12	-	-
NGC 4594	Sa	9.8	1.0 x 10^9	240	-25.4	5.1	1	-	-
NGC 4596	SB0	18.0	8.4 x 10^7	136	-22.82	2.44	3	-	-
NGC 6264	S?	136 .0	2.81 x 10^7	158.49	-22.6	6.43	4,15,13	-	-
NGC 7582	SBab	22.3	5.5 x 10^7	156	-21.96	0.712	2,15,8	41.69	2.22

[1] Galaxy Name.
[2] Morphological type.
[3] Distance in Megaparsecs.
[4] BH mass in units of solar mass.
[5] Stellar velocity dispersion.
[6] K Band bulge magnitude.
[7] Bulge effective radius in kiloparsecs.
[8] References are written as: "reference for columns 1-5," "reference for column 6," "reference for column 7". If there is only one number, it indicates the reference for columns 1-7. References: 1. Marconi & Hunt (2003), 2. Gültekin et al. (2009b), 3. Sani et al. (2011), 4. Greene et al. (2010), 6.Erwin et al. (2003), 7. Novak et al. (2006), 8. Faber et al. (1997), 9. Dong & De Robertis (2006), 10. Vika et al. (2012), 11. Beifiori et al. (2009), 12. Khorunzhev et al. (2012), 13. Pérez-González et al. (2000) , 14. Gil de Paz et al. (2007), 15. Kormendy & Ho (2013).
[9] X-ray luminosity . All are from Gültekin et al. (2009a) excluding NGC 1300, which is from Shapley et al. (2001).
[10] Star Formation Rate. Values for Circinus, NGC 1068, NGC 3227, and NGC 7582 are from Meléndez et al. (2008). The value for NGC 1300 is from Mazzuca et al. (2008).

is the kinetic energy of the stars, and

$$U = \frac{-3}{5}\frac{\mathrm{GM}M_*}{r_e}$$

is the gravitational potential energy of the galaxy of mass M with effective radius r_e. To test this, we examine the virial ratio, $\lambda = 2K/U$, of our sample in Figure 2. For simplicity, we assumed that the mass of the galaxy (M) was equal to the stellar mass (M_*), and therefore, our final calculation used

$$U = \frac{-3}{5}\frac{\mathrm{G}M_*^2}{r_e}$$

for the potential energy. The stellar mass for this figure, and all subsequent figures, is calculated from k-band absolute magnitude using a one-to-one mass to light ratio.

The results of Zhu et al. (2012) suggest that the M-σ relation evolves over time, and subsequently, the virial ratio of galaxies evolves with the M-σ relation. Ultimately, if galaxies become virilized as they approach z $\sim$ 0, the virial ratio would reach $\sim$1. Considering that we find that ellipticals more closely follow the M-σ correlation, we would predict that they have a virial ratio of $\sim$1, and therefore, we would expect spiral galaxies to have a virial ratio greater than 1. In our plot, however, we see that the elliptical and spiral samples seem to have comparable scatter and virial ratios. While this seems odd because we would expect very different ratios, the story is not complete. Because spiral galaxies do not have uniform light curves, it is difficult to define a "half-light" radius for them. The majority of effective radius values that were obtained for our spiral sample are half light radii for the bulge, and these are the galaxies with virial ratios of $\sim$1. The spiral galaxies with "effective radii" for the entire galaxy have a virial ratio much higher than 1. The scatter seen in the elliptical sample is likely due to the difficult nature of measuring the effective radius and our generalization that a one-to-one mass-to-light ratio could be used for the calculation of all galaxy masses.



Figure 2. The ratio of kinetic energy to potential energy of stellar components within the half-light radius as a function of stellar mass for our elliptical and spiral samples. Those values with a ratio of roughly 1 are described as virilized, while those that lie significantly above 1 are not virilized.

3.2. *The M_{BH}-M_{host} Correlation*

Figure 3 utilizes the BH masses published by Sun et al. (2014) and those for the five spirals with SFR and X-ray luminosity, as well as the stellar masses for these galaxies to study the M_{BH} - M_{host} relation.



Figure 3. BH mass as a function of stellar mass for Sun et al. (2014) and the five spiral galaxies with SFR and X-ray luminosities. The fittings of the full elliptical and spiral samples (Tables 1 and 2) are plotted for comparison.

While Zhu et al. (2012) found evolution in the M - σ correlation, no evolution in the M_{BH}-M_{host} correlation was found, which implies that the two correlations have very different origins. The fourth and final figure probes the possible origin of the M_{BH}-M_{host} correlation by utilizing the ratio of BH accretion rate (BHAR) to star formation rate (SFR) as a function of stellar mass and redshift for Sample 2. This ratio allows us to track the evolution of the galaxies.

SFR values for each of our AGN were taken from Sun et al. (2014), Lusso et al. (2011), and Hainline et al. (2012). The references for each of our five spirals are given in detail in Table 2. The BHAR was calculated using

$$\mathrm{BHAR} = \frac{L_{bol}}{c^2\epsilon}$$

where $\epsilon = 0.1$. X-ray luminosity was converted to bolometric luminosity using

$$L_{bol} = L_x * 22.4$$

from Mullaney et al. (2012b) when direct L_{bol} measurements were unavailable.

Zhu et al. (2012) determined through simulation that galaxies have a nearly constant ratio of BHAR to SFR over a large range of redshifts, suggesting that black holes and galaxies exhibit self-regulated growth. Silverman et al. (2009) came to similar conclusions studying the ratio of BHAR to SFR using observational data to z=2. Our sample extends the study of Silverman et al. (2009) to z=3, and further constrains the value of this ratio to $\sim 10^{-2.6}$. This constant ratio across a range of redshifts and stellar masses suggests that the galaxies and black holes exhibit self regulated growth.



Figure 4. Left: The ratio of BHAR/SFR as a function of stellar mass. Our nearly constant ratio of $\sim 10^{-2.6}$ across four orders of magnitude in stellar mass suggests that galaxies and black holes have self-regulated growth. Right: The same ratio of BHAR/SFR as a function of redshift. This expands on the work of Silverman et al. (2009), and provides evidence for self regulated growth of black holes and galaxies to redshift 3.

4. SUMMARY

Through this observational data, we investigated the origin of the M_{BH}-σ and M_{BH}-M_{host} correlations and tested the model proposed by Zhu et al. (2012). To study the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ correlation, we have used robust sample of elliptical, lenticular, and spiral galaxies. We have shown that the elliptical and lenticular galaxies closely follow the most recent fitting of the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ correlation from McConnell & Ma (2013), while the spiral galaxies tend to fall off of this correlation. In order to examine the M_{BH} - M_{host} relation, we have used a sample that combines narrow- and broad-lined AGN with a small number of spiral galaxies. We have shown that the broad-lined AGN and spirals follow the M_{BH} - M_{host} from McConnell & Ma (2013). Our findings are listed below:

1. Zhu et al. (2012) has shown that the M-σ relation shows exceptional evolution from higher redshift to lower redshift, which suggests that the virial ratio would also evolve over time. Through simulation, Zhu et al. (2012) determined that galaxies progress towards a virial ratio of $\sim$1 at z$\sim$0. Our observational data agrees with the results of Zhu et al. (2012), with some scatter caused by measurement uncertainties. At z$\sim$0, we see that galaxies falling on the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ relation tend to be viralized, while those that fall off of the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ relation are not viralized. This suggests that the $M_{\rm BH}$ - σ relation may be a result of virial equilibrium.

2. In contrast to the distinct evolution of the M-σ correlation, Zhu et al. (2012) found almost no evolution in the M_{BH}-M_{host} correlation. We utilize the ratio of BHAR/SFR as a probe of galaxy evolution, and find that the ratio remains relatively constant over several orders of magnitude in stellar mass, and a range of redshifts (z=0-3). Our nearly constant ratio of $\sim 10^{-2.6}$ agrees with the findings of Zhu et al. (2012) and Silverman et al. (2009). This nearly constant ratio indicates that the black hole and galaxy have self-regulated growth, and it is this self-regulated growth that may be the origin of the M_{BH}-M_{host} correlation.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Jenny Greene, Louis Ho, and Don Schneider for useful discussions. SS acknowledges support from the Penn State University Office of Undergraduate Education. MYS acknowledges support from the China Scholarship Council (No. [2013]3009), and the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant #11222328. JRT acknowledges support from NASA through Hubble Fellowship grant #51330 awarded by the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., for NASA under contract NAS 5-26555. YL acknowledges partial support from NSF grants AST-0965694, AST-1009867 and AST-1412719. We acknowledge the Institute For CyberScience at The Pennsylvania State University for providing computational resources and services that have contributed to the research results reported in this paper. The Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos is supported by the Eberly College of Science and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Research at the Pennsylvania State University.

REFERENCES

Baggett, W. E., Baggett, S. M., & Anderson, K. S. J. 1998, AJ, 116, 1626
Beifiori, A., Sarzi, M., Corsini, E. M., Dalla Bontà, E., Pizzella, A., Coccato, L., & Bertola, F. 2009, ApJ, 692, 856
Bennert, N., Barvainis, R., Henkel, C., & Antonucci, R. 2009, ApJ, 695, 276
Bennert, V. N., Auger, M. W., Treu, T., Woo, J.-H., & Malkan, M. A. 2011, ApJ, 742, 107
Bongiorno, A., Merloni, A., Brusa, M., Magnelli, B., Salvato, M., Mignoli, M., Zamorani, G., Fiore, F., Rosario, D., Mainieri, V., Hao, H., Comastri, A., Vignali, C., Balestra, I., Bardelli, S., Berta, S., Civano, F., Kampczyk, P., Le Floc'h, E., Lusso, E., Lutz, D., Pozzetti, L., Pozzi, F., Riguccini, L., Shankar, F., & Silverman, J. 2012, MNRAS, 427, 3103
Caccianiga, A., Severgnini, P., Della Ceca, R., Maccacaro, T., Carrera, F. J., & Page, M. J. 2007, A&A, 470, 557
Chen, C.-T. J., Hickox, R. C., Alberts, S., Brodwin, M., Jones, C., Murray, S. S., Alexander, D. M., Assef, R. J., Brown, M. J. I., Dey, A., Forman, W. R., Gorjian, V., Goulding, A. D., Le Floc'h, E., Jannuzi, B. T., Mullaney, J. R., & Pope, A. 2013, ApJ, 773, 3

Coppi, P. 2003, in American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 686, The Astrophysics of Gravitational Wave Sources, ed. J. M. Centrella, 141–150
Dalla Bontà, E., Ferrarese, L., Corsini, E. M., Miralda-Escudé, J., Coccato, L., Sarzi, M., Pizzella, A., & Beifiori, A. 2009, ApJ, 690, 537
de Vaucouleurs, G., de Vaucouleurs, A., Corwin, Jr., H. G., Buta, R. J., Paturel, G., & Fouqué, P. 1991, Third Reference Catalogue of Bright Galaxies. Volume I: Explanations and references. Volume II: Data for galaxies between 0^h and 12^h. Volume III: Data for galaxies between 12^h and 24^h.
Dong, X. Y., & De Robertis, M. M. 2006, AJ, 131, 1236
Erwin, P., Beltrán, J. C. V., Graham, A. W., & Beckman, J. E. 2003, ApJ, 597, 929
Erwin, P., Graham, A. W., & Caon, N. 2004, Coevolution of Black Holes and Galaxies
Faber, S. M., Tremaine, S., Ajhar, E. A., Byun, Y.-I., Dressler, A., Gebhardt, K., Grillmair, C., Kormendy, J., Lauer, T. R., & Richstone, D. 1997, AJ, 114, 1771
Ferrarese, L., & Merritt, D. 2000, ApJ, 539, L9
Fukazawa, Y., Hiragi, K., Mizuno, M., Nishino, S., Hayashi, K., Yamasaki, T., Shirai, H., Takahashi, H., & Ohno, M. 2011, ApJ, 727, 19
Gallego, J., Zamorano, J., Rego, M., Alonso, O., & Vitores, A. G. 1996, A&AS, 120, 323
Gebhardt, K., Bender, R., Bower, G., Dressler, A., Faber, S. M., Filippenko, A. V., Green, R., Grillmair, C., Ho, L. C., Kormendy, J., Lauer, T. R., Magorrian, J., Pinkney, J., Richstone, D., & Tremaine, S. 2000, ApJ, 539, L13
Georgakakis, A., Hopkins, A. M., Caulton, A., Wiklind, T., Terlevich, A. I., & Forbes, D. A. 2001, MNRAS, 326, 1431
Gil de Paz, A., Boissier, S., Madore, B. F., Seibert, M., Joe, Y. H., Boselli, A., Wyder, T. K., Thilker, D., Bianchi, L., Rey, S.-C., Rich, R. M., Barlow, T. A., Conrow, T., Forster, K., Friedman, P. G., Martin, D. C., Morrissey, P., Neff, S. G., Schiminovich, D., Small, T., Donas, J., Heckman, T. M., Lee, Y.-W., Milliard, B., Szalay, A. S., & Yi, S. 2007, ApJS, 173, 185
Graham, A. W., Onken, C. A., Athanassoula, E., & Combes, F. 2011, MNRAS, 412, 2211
Graham, A. W., & Scott, N. 2013, ApJ, 764, 151
Greene, J. E., Peng, C. Y., Kim, M., Kuo, C.-Y., Braatz, J. A., Impellizzeri, C. M. V., Condon, J. J., Lo, K. Y., Henkel, C., & Reid, M. J. 2010, ApJ, 721, 26
Gu, Q., Melnick, J., Cid Fernandes, R., Kunth, D., Terlevich, E., & Terlevich, R. 2006, VizieR Online Data Catalog, 736, 60480
Gültekin, K., Cackett, E. M., Miller, J. M., Di Matteo, T., Markoff, S., & Richstone, D. O. 2009a, ApJ, 706, 404
—. 2012, ApJ, 749, 129
Gültekin, K., Richstone, D. O., Gebhardt, K., Lauer, T. R., Tremaine, S., Aller, M. C., Bender, R., Dressler, A., Faber, S. M., Filippenko, A. V., Green, R., Ho, L. C., Kormendy, J., Magorrian, J., Pinkney, J., & Siopis, C. 2009b, ApJ, 698, 198
Gutiérrez, C. M., Trujillo, I., Aguerri, J. A. L., Graham, A. W., & Caon, N. 2004, ApJ, 602, 664
Haehnelt, M. G., & Kauffmann, G. 2000, MNRAS, 318, L35
Hainline, K. N., Shapley, A. E., Greene, J. E., Steidel, C. C., Reddy, N. A., & Erb, D. K. 2012, ApJ, 760, 74
Häring, N., & Rix, H.-W. 2004, ApJ, 604, L89
Hickox, R. C., Mullaney, J. R., Alexander, D. M., Chen, C.-T. J., Civano, F. M., Goulding, A. D., & Hainline, K. N. 2014, ApJ, 782, 9
Ho, L. C., Filippenko, A. V., & Sargent, W. L. W. 2003, ApJ, 583, 159
Hu, J. 2008, MNRAS, 386, 2242
—. 2009, ArXiv e-prints
Jahnke, K., Bongiorno, A., Brusa, M., Capak, P., Cappelluti, N., Cisternas, M., Civano, F., Colbert, J., Comastri, A., Elvis, M., Hasinger, G., Ilbert, O., Impey, C., Inskip, K., Koekemoer, A. M., Lilly, S., Maier, C., Merloni, A., Riechers, D., Salvato, M., Schinnerer, E., Scoville, N. Z., Silverman, J., Taniguchi, Y., Trump, J. R., & Yan, L. 2009, ApJ, 706, L215
Kailey, W. F., & Lebofsky, M. J. 1988, ApJ, 326, 653
Kennicutt, Jr., R. C. 1998, ARA&A, 36, 189
Khorunzhev, G. A., Sazonov, S. Y., Burenin, R. A., & Tkachenko, A. Y. 2012, Astronomy Letters, 38, 475
Kormendy, J., Bender, R., & Cornell, M. E. 2011, Nature, 469, 374
Kormendy, J., Drory, N., Bender, R., & Cornell, M. E. 2010, ApJ, 723, 54
Kormendy, J., & Gebhardt, K. 2001, in American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 586, 20th Texas Symposium on relativistic astrophysics, ed. J. C. Wheeler & H. Martel, 363–381
Kormendy, J., & Ho, L. C. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
Kormendy, J., & Richstone, D. 1995, ARA&A, 33, 581
Kuo, C. Y., Braatz, J. A., Condon, J. J., Impellizzeri, C. M. V., Lo, K. Y., Zaw, I., Schenker, M., Henkel, C., Reid, M. J., & Greene, J. E. 2011, ApJ, 727, 20
Lauer, T. R., Tremaine, S., Richstone, D., & Faber, S. M. 2007, ApJ, 670, 249
Lusso, E., Comastri, A., Vignali, C., Zamorani, G., Treister, E., Sanders, D., Bolzonella, M., Bongiorno, A., Brusa, M., Civano, F., Gilli, R., Mainieri, V., Nair, P., Aller, M. C., Carollo, M., Koekemoer, A. M., Merloni, A., & Trump, J. R. 2011, A&A, 534, A110
Magorrian, J., Tremaine, S., Richstone, D., Bender, R., Bower, G., Dressler, A., Faber, S. M., Gebhardt, K., Green, R., Grillmair, C., Kormendy, J., & Lauer, T. 1998, AJ, 115, 2285
Marconi, A., & Hunt, L. K. 2003, ApJ, 589, L21
Mazzuca, L. M., Knapen, J. H., Veilleux, S., & Regan, M. W. 2008, ApJS, 174, 337
McConnell, N. J., & Ma, C.-P. 2013, ApJ, 764, 184
McLure, R. J., & Dunlop, J. S. 2002, MNRAS, 331, 795
Meléndez, M., Kraemer, S. B., Schmitt, H. R., Crenshaw, D. M., Deo, R. P., Mushotzky, R. F., & Bruhweiler, F. C. 2008, ApJ, 689, 95
Merloni, A., Bongiorno, A., Bolzonella, M., Brusa, M., Civano, F., Comastri, A., Elvis, M., Fiore, F., Gilli, R., Hao, H., Jahnke, K., Koekemoer, A. M., Lusso, E., Mainieri, V., Mignoli, M., Miyaji, T., Renzini, A., Salvato, M., Silverman, J., Trump, J., Vignali, C., Zamorani, G., Capak, P., Lilly, S. J., Sanders, D., Taniguchi, Y., Bardelli, S., Carollo, C. M., Caputi, K., Contini, T., Coppa, G., Cucciati, O., de la Torre, S., de Ravel, L., Franzetti, P., Garilli, B., Hasinger, G., Impey, C., Iovino, A., Iwasawa, K., Kampczyk, P., Kneib, J.-P., Knobel, C., Kovač, K., Lamareille, F., Le Borgne, J.-F., Le Brun, V., Le Fèvre, O., Maier, C., Pello, R., Peng, Y., Perez Montero, E., Ricciardelli, E., Scodeggio, M., Tanaka, M., Tasca, L. A. M., Tresse, L., Vergani, D., & Zucca, E. 2010, ApJ, 708, 137
Mullaney, J. R., Daddi, E., Béthermin, M., Elbaz, D., Juneau, S., Pannella, M., Sargent, M. T., Alexander, D. M., & Hickox, R. C. 2012a, ApJ, 753, L30
—. 2012b, ApJ, 753, L30
Mullaney, J. R., Pannella, M., Daddi, E., Alexander, D. M., Elbaz, D., Hickox, R. C., Bournaud, F., Altieri, B., Aussel, H., Coia, D., Dannerbauer, H., Dasyra, K., Dickinson, M., Hwang, H. S., Kartaltepe, J., Leiton, R., Magdis, G., Magnelli, B., Popesso, P., Valtchanov, I., Bauer, F. E., Brandt, W. N., Del Moro, A., Hanish, D. J., Ivison, R. J., Juneau, S., Luo, B., Lutz, D., Sargent, M. T., Scott, D., & Xue, Y. Q. 2012c, MNRAS, 419, 95
Novak, G. S., Faber, S. M., & Dekel, A. 2006, ApJ, 637, 96
Peng, C. Y., Impey, C. D., Rix, H.-W., Kochanek, C. S., Keeton, C. R., Falco, E. E., Lehár, J., & McLeod, B. A. 2006, ApJ, 649, 616
Pérez-González, P. G., Zamorano, J., Gallego, J., & Gil de Paz, A. 2000, A&AS, 141, 409
Prugniel, P., Zeilinger, W., Koleva, M., & de Rijcke, S. 2011, A&A, 528, A128
Robitaille, T. P., & Whitney, B. A. 2010, ApJ, 710, L11
Rosario, D. J., Mozena, M., Wuyts, S., Nandra, K., Koekemoer, A., McGrath, E., Hathi, N. P., Dekel, A., Donley, J., Dunlop, J. S., Faber, S. M., Ferguson, H., Giavalisco, M., Grogin, N., Guo, Y., Kocevski, D. D., Koo, D. C., Laird, E., Newman, J., Rangel, C., & Somerville, R. 2013a, ApJ, 763, 59
Rosario, D. J., Santini, P., Lutz, D., Netzer, H., Bauer, F. E., Berta, S., Magnelli, B., Popesso, P., Alexander, D. M., Brandt, W. N., Genzel, R., Maiolino, R., Mullaney, J. R., Nordon, R., Saintonge, A., Tacconi, L., & Wuyts, S. 2013b, ApJ, 771, 63
Sani, E., Marconi, A., Hunt, L. K., & Risaliti, G. 2011, MNRAS, 413, 1479
Sargsyan, L., Weedman, D., Lebouteiller, V., Houck, J., Barry, D., Hovhannisyan, A., & Mickaelian, A. 2011, ApJ, 730, 19

Schmitt, H. R., Donley, J. L., Antonucci, R. R. J., Hutchings, J. B., & Kinney, A. L. 2003, ApJS, 148, 327
Schramm, M., & Silverman, J. D. 2013, ApJ, 767, 13
Shapley, A., Fabbiano, G., & Eskridge, P. B. 2001, ApJS, 137, 139
Shen, Y., & Kelly, B. C. 2010, ApJ, 713, 41
Silverman, J. D., Lamareille, F., Maier, C., Lilly, S. J., Mainieri, V., Brusa, M., Cappelluti, N., Hasinger, G., Zamorani, G., Scodeggio, M., Bolzonella, M., Contini, T., Carollo, C. M., Jahnke, K., Kneib, J.-P., Le Fèvre, O., Merloni, A., Bardelli, S., Bongiorno, A., Brunner, H., Caputi, K., Civano, F., Comastri, A., Coppa, G., Cucciati, O., de la Torre, S., de Ravel, L., Elvis, M., Finoguenov, A., Fiore, F., Franzetti, P., Garilli, B., Gilli, R., Iovino, A., Kampczyk, P., Knobel, C., Kovač, K., Le Borgne, J.-F., Le Brun, V., Mignoli, M., Pello, R., Peng, Y., Perez Montero, E., Ricciardelli, E., Tanaka, M., Tasca, L., Tresse, L., Vergani, D., Vignali, C., Zucca, E., Bottini, D., Cappi, A., Cassata, P., Fumana, M., Griffiths, R., Kartaltepe, J., Koekemoer, A., Marinoni, C., McCracken, H. J., Memeo, P., Meneux, B., Oesch, P., Porciani, C., & Salvato, M. 2009, ApJ, 696, 396
Sun, M., Trump, J. R., Brandt, W. N., Luo, B., Alexander, D., Jahnke, K., Rosario, D. J., Wang, S. X., & Xue, Y. Q. 2014, submitted
Tremaine, S., Gebhardt, K., Bender, R., Bower, G., Dressler, A., Faber, S. M., Filippenko, A. V., Green, R., Grillmair, C., Ho, L. C., Kormendy, J., Lauer, T. R., Magorrian, J., Pinkney, J., & Richstone, D. 2002, ApJ, 574, 740
Treu, T., Woo, J.-H., Malkan, M. A., & Blandford, R. D. 2007, ApJ, 667, 117
Vika, M., Driver, S. P., Cameron, E., Kelvin, L., & Robotham, A. 2012, MNRAS, 419, 2264
Wu, Y., Charmandaris, V., Huang, J., Spinoglio, L., & Tommasin, S. 2009, ApJ, 701, 658
Zhu, Q., Li, Y., & Sherman, S. 2012, ArXiv e-prints